

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. The Examiner objected to Claims 11-15 and rejected Claims 1-15. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 13 and 15 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by published U.S. Application No. 2002/0002442 to Ames et al. ("the Ames reference"). The Examiner further rejected Claims 3, 7, 9, 11 and 14 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ames reference. The Examiner further rejected Claims 4-5 and 12 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ames reference and U.S. Patent No. 5,869,940 to Parsadayan ("the Parsadayan patent").

#### **Objections to Claims 11-15**

The Examiner objected to Claims 11-15 for formalistic reasons. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the numbering of the newly presented claims. In response, original Claim 15 has been renumbered as Claim 11, and previously presented Claims 11-14 have been renumbered as Claims 12-15, respectively.

#### **Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 10 under § 102(e)**

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1 and 10 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Ames reference. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as previously pending are patentably distinguished over the Ames reference and the other cited references or any combination thereof. Claims 1 and 10, however, have been amended without altering their scope in order to correct grammatical mistakes and clarify the features of Applicant's inventions. These claim amendments are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments.

### **Claim 1**

Focusing in particular on Claim 1 and the embodiment shown in FIG. 1, a monitoring system for promptly detecting a fault in a security gate system is described. The monitoring system includes a diagnostic module (21) that actively monitors parameters of a security gate system (31). The diagnostic module (21) automatically sends a message (41) via a first, local communication unit (27) to a second, remote communication unit (43 or 49) when a problem arises with the security gate system (31).

The Examiner's position is that the Ames reference discloses that "said microprocessor [200] of watch commander unit monitors the operational parameters of the sentry unit and when any of said operational parameters of the system reach a pre-designated (predetermined) level which met by the internal rules set, the watch commander reports to said host computer." The Examiner cites FIG. 3 and paragraphs 0063, 0091-0094, and 0096-0099 of the Ames reference as supporting this description.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the Ames reference. For example, the Ames reference only discloses that the watch commander units are slave units and only report operational parameters to the host computer when polled by the host computer. Thus, the Ames reference does not disclose that the watch commander will automatically send a report to the host computer upon an operational parameter reaching a pre-designated level.

Thus, Applicant asserts that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Ames reference because, among other reasons, the Ames reference does not disclose, teach or suggest a system for monitoring the operation of a security system that includes a microcontroller that "monitors the operational parameters of the security system and when any of the parameters of the system reach a pre-designated level, said diagnostic module automatically communicates at least one of said operational parameters over said communication unit to said remote monitor," as required in amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and respectfully requests allowance of Claim 1.

**Claim 10**

As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, the Ames reference only discloses that the watch commander units are slave units and only report operational parameters to the host computer when polled by the host computer. Thus, the Ames does not anticipate Claim 10 because, among other reasons, the Ames reference does not disclose that “upon detection of at least one predetermined change in an operational parameters of the security system said microcontroller causes said first two-way communication unit to send a signal to said second two-way communication unit,” as required in amended Claim 10. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 10 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and respectfully requests allowance of Claim 10.

**Dependant Claims 2-9 and 11-15**

Claims 2-9 which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 11-15 which depend from Claim 10, are patentable for the same reasons articulated above with regard to Claim 1 and Claim 10, respectively, and because of the additional features recited therein. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 2-9 and 11-15.

**NEW CLAIMS**

New method Claims 16-19 have been added to more fully define the Applicant's invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the prior art of record.

Appl. No. 10/027,600  
Amdt. dated September 11, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of May 27, 2003

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the forgoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved. Also, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502323.

Respectfully submitted,  
LEVIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP

By Randall L. Reed  
Randall L. Reed, Esq.  
Reg. No. 31,559  
Tel. # (949) 497-7676